DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 124 497 SP 010 059

AUTHOR Swann, Margaret H.
TITLE Evaluation of the Shepherd College EXEL Program.
INSTITUTION Shepherd Coll., Shepherdstown, W. Va.
SPONS AGENCY Regional Education Service Agency, Region 8, Martinsburg, W. Va.
PUB DATE [76]
NOTE 35p.; Prepared by the Teacher Education Center; Best copy available

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cooperating Teachers; *Elementary Education; Preservice Education; *Principals; Questionnaires; *Student Teachers; Student Teaching; Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS EXEL Program; Experimental Program in Elementary Education

ABSTRACT

This is a report on the experimental program in elementary education (EXEL) at Shepherd College. The stated philosophy of the program is that teachers in training need more contact earlier with the public schools--that is, that all theory with practice delayed until later results in little application of theory because too much time has elapsed before there is opportunity for practice. The information in this report is based on data gathered from two questionnaires devised to evaluate the success of the program. In the first questionnaire, principals and cooperating teachers in schools where the 12 graduating EXEL participants were doing their student teaching were asked to rate the students on nine qualities that had been identified as important for success as a teacher. The second questionnaire, EXEL Perceptions, contained two parts and concerned working relationships and integration of off-campus with campus experience. The second questionnaire was also completed by the principals and cooperating teachers. The appendix contains the questionnaires and a suggested schedule for students in the EXEL program. (RC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED1244497

E X E L P R O G R A M

SHEPHERD COLLEGE

DIVISION OF EDUCATION

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Program Director

Mrs. Margaret H. Swann

Acknowledgements

Much of the credit for the success of the EXEL program must be given to Dr. Carroll Palmer, Chairman of the Division of Education, Shepherd College, who conceived the idea and developed the sequence of the program in the first place; to Mrs. Martha Josephs, Director of Career Opportunities Program, CIC, RESA VIII, who gave valuable help in developing the content of the seminars and field experiences; to Dr. Dennis Benson, RESA VIII, who supported the project with his interest and funds from RESA Teacher Education Center budget; to the professors at Shepherd, who rearranged schedules and accepted responsibilities in connection with seminars and field experiences over and above their normal teaching load; to the superintendents, supervisors, and teachers in Region VIII who cooperated so generously in accepting and working with students in the EXEL program; and to Miss Nancy Parker, secretary in the Division of Education, who handled a tremendous amount of the paper work involved in the program.

EVALUATION OF THE SHEPHERD COLLEGE EXEL PROGRAM

In the spring of 1973, Shepherd College was authorized by the West Virginia State Department of Education to begin an experimental program in elementary education (EXEL) which would be operated in addition to the regular program. The basic philosophy underlying this new program, which was modeled after the Career Opportunities Program, was the belief that teachers in training need more contact earlier with the public schools -- that all theory with practice delayed until later resulted in little application of theory at all because too much time had elapsed before there was opportunity for practice.

Some basic assumptions underlying the development of the program were: (1) Contact with children in public schools early in the teacher education program concurrent with theory and methods classes would result in more confident, competent teachers. (2) Early and systematic participation in public school classrooms would help the students become more realistic about their aspirations i.e., the program would be a realistic screening process. (3) Continuous supervision and counseling by both college and public school personnel over a long period of time would enhance the personal growth and development of the potential teacher. (4) A variety of field experiences in different settings (open, traditional, rural, urban) would broaden the options open to prospective teachers as well as provide a sound background for making choices. (5) The extended field experience would encourage closer cooperation and communication between public school teachers and college methods instructors.

EXEL provided continuous field experience from the second semester of the sophomore year through a final six weeks of student teaching. The integrated methods was abandoned and a series of five special methods seminars running concurrently with full-day experiences in the public schools was devised. The students began one day's field experience each week and a seminar in physical education activities the second semester of their sophomore year. In following semesters the subject matter of seminars changed to social studies, math and science, language arts and reading, music and art, with the field experience increasing to two full days in the second semester of the junior year. The final semester involved ten weeks of two days per week participation followed by six weeks of full-time student teaching. During the field experience, the student was expected to participate as an instructional aide with specific responsibilities for conducting learning experiences in the various subject matter areas being taught in the seminar.

Participation in the program was voluntary. Several orientation sessions were held in the fall of 1972 and by spring 1973, eighteen students had indicated their interest in the program. By end of that semester, six had dropped out -- two because they found the program too demanding on their time. These were scholarship students who had campus jobs. These students later finished in the traditional program. Two dropped out of school completely, one decided teaching was not for her, and one was counseled to leave the program because of what appeared to be lack of commitment. The remaining twelve have stayed to complete the program very successfully this spring.

A second group of thirteen began in the spring of 1975. Of this group only one dropped out, leaving twelve. This group will finish in May 1976.

The third group to enter in the spring of 1975 increased to twenty-two. Out of this group, one girl was killed in an automobile accident and one dropped out because she decided teaching was not for her. We expect to add a transfer student to this group next fall making a total of 21.

Twenty-three schools in Jefferson, Berkeley, and Morgan counties of West Virginia and Washington County, Maryland have served as field locations for EXEL students. Most of these schools are in small towns or semi-rural areas. One is quite typical of Appalachia, a truly mountain school. Some of the schools in Washington County were in the suburbs of Hagerstown, a small city of 85,000 people. In some schools the black population was quite high; in others, practically non-existent. Six were very modern open classroom buildings. In some schools there was an abundance of instructional materials; in others, hardly any. An effort was made to have every student experience both upper and lower elementary levels and open and traditional classrooms.

Because the administration of the program was done by a staff member over and above her full-time teaching load, it was necessary to depend heavily on feedback from public school cooperating teachers. Evaluation sheets for each field practicum were devised and revised [redacted]. In addition to describing the participation experiences of the students, the cooperating teachers were asked each semester about the professional potential of the student and whether he should be encouraged to continue in the program.

EVALUATION

In an attempt to evaluate the success of the program, particularly in terms of the quality of the twelve graduating participants, two questionnaires were devised. Principals and cooperating teachers in schools where the twelve graduating EXEL participants were doing their student teaching were asked to rate these students on nine qualities (See Student Teacher Follow-up Questionnaire, Appendix), we had identified as being important for success as a teacher. They were asked to rate the EXEL students as to whether they exhibited these qualities not as well as, as well as, or better than other student teachers they had supervised. The results converted to percentages follow:

	Not as well as	As well as	Better than
1. Academic Background	0%	48%	52%
2. Knowledge and Use of Good Teaching Methods	0	48	52
3. Creative Input	0	57	43
4. Confidence, Self-assurance	5	30	65
5. Professionalism	5	45	50
6. Cooperation-Teamwork	5	52	43
7. Discipline	15	52	33
8. Emotional Stability	9	67	24
9. Overall Performance	9	24	67

Returns on this questionnaire were a bit disappointing in that several (at least 5) of the cooperating teachers had not had student teachers before so they felt unable to complete the questionnaire. All of these teachers, however, were well satisfied with the performance of their student teachers and commented that they wished they had the wealth of pre-student-teaching experience these students had brought to their assignment.

Allowing for individual differences and variables over which we had no control, such as personality clashes, personal biases, and the

possibility that these teachers (as they expressed it) found it difficult to compare individuals under different circumstances, the results seem fairly positive. One obvious concern is in the area of discipline -- which is also a concern in terms of our traditional program. One explanation given by cooperating teachers concerning discipline problems was that the shorter time alloted to EXEL student teaching did not give the students a chance to develop and perfect their own standards and adhere to them consistently. Being in schools two days a week that were not consecutive days also caused problems in terms of following through with standards. There seemed to be a rather strong feeling that two non-consecutive days was not good. (Comment: This will continue to be a problem until we can convince college administrators and professors that you can teach a 3-hour course just as well on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday as you can on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday.) Certainly, however, these opinions would suggest that we give more attention in methods seminars to class management and discipline techniques.

The coordinator plans to follow up these twelve graduates with the same questionnaire after they have had a year's experience on the job. Perhaps results then can be assumed to be more valid than any data we could gather at this point.

The second questionnaire, EXEL Perceptions, had two parts and concerned working relationships and integration of off-campus with campus experience. We tried to measure the perceptions of public school personnel [redacted] as to their roles, the role of the college supervisor, the communication between the colleges and the public schools, and the variety of experiences the students had.

Respondents were asked to check highly successful, average success, or little or no success concerning the following data. Percentages of responses are given in three categories: principals, cooperating teachers, and principals and cooperating teachers together. Eighteen principals responded out of a possible 22. Sixty-two cooperating teachers out of possible 108 replied. Considering the fact that participation in the program goes back three years, this was a fair response. Results are given in percentages.

EXEL PERCEPTIONS

Data on Working Relationships

Item	Principals			Cooperating Teachers			Principals and Cooperating Teachers		
	Highly successful	Average success	Little or no success	Highly successful	Average success	Little or no success	Highly successful	Average success	Little or no success
1. The Exel program provides for a closer relationship between the Shepherd College faculty, the EXEL cooperating teachers, and the building principal in meeting the needs of the college students.	53%	29%	18%	21%	73%	6%	29%	63%	8%
2. The EXEL program provides for adequate interaction between the college and the schools in the program.	33	61	6	18	70	12	20	73	7
3. The cooperating teacher has the opportunity to communicate the concerns and problems of the cooperating school to the college.	33	60	7	20	53	27	23	54	23
4. The college supervisor is an effective liaison between the college and the public school.	48	52	0	21	69	12	26	63	11
5. The college supervisor is effective in interpreting the general requirements of the various field practicums to the cooperating teacher.	44	56	0	24	61	15	35	61	14

EXEL PERCEPTIONS, cont'd.

Data on Working Relationships

Item	Principals			Cooperating Teachers			Principals and Cooperating Teachers		
	Highly successful	Average success	Little or no success	Highly successful	Average success	Little or no success	Highly successful	Average success	Little or no success
6. The building principal is able to provide EXEL students with information about the school, curriculum, student population, the staff, and the community.	59	41	0	53	44	3	54	43	3
7. The college conveys the idea to cooperating teachers and principals that it views them as valuable extensions of the college's commitment to teacher education.	59	41	0	47	49	4	50	47	3

DATA ON INTEGRATION OF ON-CAMPUS AND FIELD PRACTICUM OF EXEL STUDENTS

The student had the opportunity to:

1. Observe children in many formal and informal activities found in the elementary school.	90	10	0	74	26	0	77	23	0
2. Establish a personal rapport with the class.	59	41	0	63	35	2	62	35	3
3. Become familiar with curriculum and materials in all subject areas.	47	53	7	31	63	6	37	60	3

DATA ON INTEGRATION OF ON-CAMPUS AND FIELD PRACTICUM OF EXEL STUDENTS, cont'd.

Item	Principals			Cooperating Teachers			Principals and Cooperating Teachers		
	Highly successful	Average success	Little or no success	Highly successful	Average success	Little or no success	Highly successful	Average success	Little or no success
4. Plan, teach and evaluate a number of lessons involving a single child and a group of children.	100	0	0	64	35	1	73	26	1
5. Become familiar with children in a classroom and their general learning needs.	65	35	0	62	36	2	63	36	1
*6. Work with children in an informal analysis of reading level and math skills.	65	35	0	* 45	53	2	50	48	2
7. Conduct pupil-teacher conferences and record observations and impressions.	16	84	0	22	42	36	21	51	28
8. Become familiar with the concept of grouping for instruction on the basis of need.	48	48	4	45	48	5	46	47	7
9. Use various available kinds of media and materials.	69	31	0	60	40	0	62	38	0
10. Carry out some of the non-instructional tasks of a teacher.	59	29	12	48	47	5	54	39	7

*EXEL III (22 students) by nature of their assignment (physical education) had little opportunity to work in these areas.

DATA ON INTEGRATION OF ON-CAMPUS AND FIELD PRACTICUM OF EXEL STUDENTS, cont'd.

Item	Principals			Cooperating Teachers			Principals and Cooperating Teachers		
	Highly successful	Average success	Little or no success	Highly successful	Average success	Little or no success	Highly successful	Average success	Little or no success
11. Relate the on-campus education course work to the field experience in seminars.	33	67	0	35	58	7	34	62	4
12. Put into practice the concepts and procedures presented in the on-campus methods seminars.	56	48	0	39	53	8	43	51	6
13. One of the major improvements is the opportunity for teachers in public schools to provide the kinds of learning experiences students need in order to relate what is being discussed and proposed in methods classrooms to the real world of children and classrooms.	87	13	0	69	31	0	71	29	0
14. The structure of the EXEL program and the more intensive clinical experience develop a higher level of competence generally on the part of the EXEL student.	65	29	6	63	36	7	63	30	7

Since one of the objectives of the program was to develop a closer relationship between the college and the cooperating schools, I feel some concern about the negative responses to the first three questions on the part of the principals. My own perceptions were that there had been much more communication with public schools in this program than in our regular program. I feel positive this was true up until this semester when the 22 new students entered the program. There was no way to identify these new cooperating teachers and principals. However, because of the size of this group as compared to the total group, it is reasonable to suppose that approximately half of the responses came from teachers who had supervised these 22 new entrants.

The second part of the questionnaire dealt with data on integration of on-campus instruction with field practicum experiences. Most responses were quite positive. Again, since one of the objectives of the program is to help students integrate their on-campus course work with their field experience and respondents felt we had only moderate success here, I felt some concern. One wonders if the principals were entirely aware of just what question 11 was designed to measure for in question 13, which is similar except that it is phrased from the point of view of the public school, the response was overwhelmingly positive.

The responses of the cooperating teachers seemed to indicate less positive perceptions concerning working relationships than those reported by the principals. Perhaps there was more contact by the coordinator with the principals than with the coordinating teachers. Often when the coordinator visited a classroom, the cooperating teacher was busy with other teaching duties. It would seem that some serious consideration needs to be given to devising techniques to provide better communication.

Again, staff time is a factor here. Also, the cooperating teacher must be willing to read the guidelines and course requirements and make some effort herself to communicate concerns. There were many times when I felt teachers had not looked at the evaluation sheets until they were ready to send in the evaluation - so, of course, they were vague about what was expected. More inservice in the area of expectations is a "must". This is why, under recommendations, I have suggested that seminar professors must observe the field experiences of their students. They must also have time to acquaint the cooperating teacher <u>at the beginning</u> of the semester with the objectives and requirements of the field experience.

One other bit of feedback that was not included in the questionnaire, but seemed so important to the cooperating teachers that they included some write-in responses, concerned the amount of time spent in the classroom. Because of scheduling difficulties, some EXEL participants have had to arrive after school began or leave before it closed. This seemed to upset the cooperating teachers and some principals. They were particularly vehement about the first ten weeks of the final semester when students had only two days a week (not consecutive) in schools and were required to do special lessons in music and art. The final six weeks was full-time student teaching, but the teachers felt this was not long enough and that EXEL student teachers were overburdened with campus requirements when they should have been free to give themselves totally to their student teaching experience. This was especially acute for students in Early Childhood Education who had to divide the six weeks into two segments of three weeks each, one in kindergarten and the other in an elementary grade. The EXEL students themselves were very outspoken

about this, too. (See quotes later in the article.) I would also tend to agree, and we have considered this in planning our new elementary program.

In interpreting the data gathered from the questionnaire several points should be kept in mind.

(1) The questionnaire asking principals and teachers to compare EXEL student teachers with other student teachers went only to personnel involved with the twelve seniors.

(2) The second questionnaire concerning perceptions and roles went to all personnel who have participated in EXEL over the past three years [redacted]. Since teachers retire and change jobs, the sampling from the previous two years was limited. The cooperating teachers who had the group that began this semester were readily available and, since there were almost twice as many in the 1975 beginning group (22 as opposed to 12) the response of these teachers influenced the total response. The coordinator anticipated that the responses in the area of liaison between college supervision and cooperating teacher might be negative as time and load did not permit the coordinator to visit these schools and teachers as she had in the former two years. Also, because of funds available through RESA, we had been able to have an orientation dinner for all cooperating teachers and principals during the first two years of the program. Funds and time were not available to continue that practice for the Spring 1975 group; consequently, there was definitely a minimum amount of communication. Also, because of the size of this group, there was a necessity for using many schools and teachers not used before. These conditions definitely limited the communication between coordinator and schools this semester.

(3) The graduating EXEL participants also questioned the communication between the college and the cooperating schools. One said that it "often seemed schools were uninformed." When one considers the reams of guidelines, evaluation sheets, course requirement, etc., that went out to each cooperating teacher, one wonders what became of them. Perhaps the answer is that there must be person-to-person communication -- paper work just does not get the job done.

SUBJECTIVE EVALUATIONS

The difficulty of quantifying evaluative information is well-known and we make no claim to having any really definitive information. Perhaps the most valid observations are those made by our own staff involved in the program and the students themselves. I have tried to summarize some of these.

One of the subjective evaluations that both college and public school supervisors made concerning EXEL was that these students seemed so much more confident and ready for their full-time student teaching experience than the students in our regular program. To test this subjective evaluation, The Teacher Assurance Index (see Appendix), a questionnaire designed to assess the student teacher's feelings of security and preparedness as he/she approached various teaching tasks, was administered to all student teachers assigned to student teaching in the spring semester 1975. Fifteen statements dealing with such factors as preparing tests, lesson plans, understanding of developmental needs, verbalizing rationale for grading, individualizing instruction, knowledge of curriculum materials, etc., required the student to check a five-point rating scale ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree."

The scores were then weighted, assigning 5 points to the most positive rating and 1 to the least positive. Scores for EXEL students were identified and compared with those of students in the traditional program. EXEL represented one-third of the group. Since the total number was small (thirty-three), no attempt was made to apply tests for significance of difference. However, mean and median scores seem to show some interesting differences, as shown below. Total possible score was 75.

Mean of the total group (33)	55.69
Mean for EXEL	60.18
Mean for students in traditional program	53.50
Median for total group	57
Median for EXEL	62
Median for those in traditional program	55

While no statistical tests were made to determine significance, it would seem that one could conclude that, as a whole, EXEL students did seem to feel more confidence and assurance as they approached the teaching task than did students in the traditional program.

SOME INFORMAL OBSERVATIONS

EXEL students seemed to be more aware of a rationale for doing what they were doing. Time and again I saw them consciously applying methodology and learning theory covered in their field experience seminars. They seemed to know why they designed learning experiences in certain ways rather than other ways and were able to diagnose their difficulties and relate them to a particular theory. They often questioned manual suggestions or methods used by their cooperating teachers on the grounds that they did not feel they were educationally sound. It was as though they had already come to terms with a philosophy of teaching that made sense to them, that they were comfortable with.

I don't often see this with students in our traditional program. They are usually very dependent on teachers' manuals and cooperating teachers' direction. Perhaps the reason for this is that for most of these students, student teaching is the first real classroom experience they have had since they were in elementary school. They may have observed briefly or worked on a one-to-one basis with elementary age children during their Human Development course, but they have had little opportunity to relate theory to practice. EXEL students, on the other hand, have been in four other classrooms for sustained periods of time and have seen some good and some bad, some successful and unsuccessful teaching, and have had the opportunity to try out a variety of approaches for themselves. They have come to terms with "cooperating teachers" as an image, know they are human, and developed some criteria for judgment.

This kind of development is not without its hazards. We have noted an independence on the part of EXEL students that does not always endear them to principals and cooperating teachers. If they believe in something, it violates their integrity if they have to compromise. At the same time, they can tolerate some things secure in the confidence that when they have their own classrooms, they will operate in terms of their own basic beliefs. In other words, I have confidence that these students will not capitulate to a system that violates what they believe is right and good for children.

I have also seen this independence exhibited in other ways -- in the setting of priorities, in frustration with rigid scheduling which limits exploration, in a tendency to make unilateral decisions which may get them into trouble. EXEL students have had to be treated in special ways -- in regard to scheduling, in respect to much more individualized attention and counseling than students in the regular program. This has

tended to develop ego-strength and positive self-image which, of course, results in a more aggresive, confident approach to decision making. Perhaps their development is somewhat analagous to that of children in a truly open, individualized school program where decision making is encouraged. It is rather ridiculous to expect these children to be docile acceptors of authoritative demands.

A unique opportunity enjoyed by EXEL has been their chance to work with several teachers in a team situation. In fact, in many instances they have worked on teams consisting of lead teachers, team teachers, student teachers in our traditional program, teacher aides, and other EXEL students. This has enabled them to understand differentiated staffing and to observe the various levels of competence and responsibility that exist in an ungraded, open situation. It has also helped them become aware of roles and potential problems encountered in a team situation.

While the extended classroom experience is the real strength of the program, it also has its hazards. In fact, we feel that perhaps five semesters of participation results in "over-kill". We'll let the students speak for themselves concerning this and other items.

THE STUDENTS SPEAK

The twelve EXEL graduates summarized their feelings about the program in a written evaluation at the end of their student teaching block much better than I could possibly do. The following quotations reflect some of the subjective observations already noted. They also point out some very important changes that must be made.

CONCERNING LENGTH OF TIME

"If anything, the EXEL program has been too much experience, if there is such a thing. I grew tired of doing for others and wished only for a class of my own."

"I feel...that the program is drawn out over too long a period of time. Perhaps it should be four semesters instead of five."

"I strongly feel that the student teaching semester should consist of only classes which can be finished in the first 10-12 weeks of the semester, leaving the last six to eight weeks totally free for student teaching. Even though I had experience in teaching, I found student teaching every day a full-time job and it was nearly impossible to meet other class requirements."

"I am frankly tired of being in someone else's classroom. I believe the program is one semester too long."

"On the opposite end, there are some aspects of EXEL that need to be changed. First of all, there is a tremendous work load involved. Until this final semester, it was nothing that a little hard work and dedication could not conquer. However, this last semester the pressure to get everything done and done well seemed at times almost unbearable. Any night class during student teaching is definitely asking for too much... I felt constant pressure and tension to get everything done; those feelings do not benefit anyone, especially a student teacher who must be ready to give 100% every day of the week."

"One final drawback--I believe that EXEL is perhaps one semester too long. Although I am enjoying this semester, I feel that I have been 'watched' enough; maybe it's just a little of my impatience surfacing, but I have 'practiced' enough--I want a chance to do it on my own!"

ON VARIETY OF EXPERIENCES

"...the opportunity the program gives for teaching under different programs, teachers, and situations gives the student a more realistic outlook on the teaching profession. In this respect, it gave me personally the ability to 'roll with the punches' and accept many different ideas."

"I feel I learned much more from the seminars than I could have possibly learned from the integrated methods course."

"Of course, I have always realized that all individuals are unique, but the whole concept of individual differences has definitely been clarified for me in such a broad range of experiences....Each school in which I have worked (from B-R Elementary, a traditional classroom, rural mountain school, to G----, open space, well-equipped modern school) has had positive and negative aspects. I have worked with every grade level except fourth and I have found that each offers its own particular attractions (as well as drawbacks) for me as a teacher.

With such a wealth of background experience...how can I help but be a better teacher? When I defend or criticize a particular reading program or when I suggest an effective way of dealing with a 'problem child', I can offer my view based not only on what I have been told or what I think, but on what I've actually seen and experienced in my own direct experience...there is no substitute for practical experience as a basic learning process."

ON PERSONAL GROWTH

"I am perfectly at ease with children and have confidence not only in subject matter but in myself...I think the secret of our success has been the closeness and cooperation of our group socially and professionally, and most of all our leader, Mrs. -----."

"When I remember my first semester at W-D Elementary, I see a girl who was very self-conscious and often unable to handle different situations. I also remember the girl who felt teachers were always perfect people, but I soon found that they too possessed many human qualities that aren't always flattering. I was guilty, then, of being a teacher who planned lessons only for the sake of the activity, not for the growth of the child."

"EXEL experience has not only given me background for teaching, but leadership and, most important, it has helped me grow and mature as a person...It has been a lot of hard work, some depressing times, and some of the most gratifying moments of my life...Through all the semesters I have acquired techniques for discipline, worked in open and traditional classrooms, seen good and bad teachers, and I have discovered who I am."

"Two things I can say: I have enjoyed my many students and I care what is taught to each of them. I want my children to love life and enjoy learning."

"Despite all the hardships, work, uncertainties, blood, sweat, and ditto masters, I am not sorry I was in EXEL. If I had it to do all over again, I would do the exact same thing."

"I have drastically realized the extent to which children are at the mercy of their teachers."

"A principle in which I have always believed has been re-affirmed: People, whether adults or children, tend to live up to your expectations. Set your sights a little beyond what you think can be accomplished...If a child is never asked to reach a little higher...how will he ever realize his full potential? I am constantly amazed at what elementary children are capable of accomplishing."

PROPOSED CHANGES IN EXEL

It is the intention of the Division of Education to incorporate the best features of EXEL into the regular elementary teacher education program. We plan to carry the second group (12) through to graduation under the original program with some slight modifications outlined below. It is hoped that the third group (22) will be able to move into the modified EXEL - elementary sequence in the spring semester, 1976.

EXEL II: Modifications as a result of first group critiques

Art and Crafts in Elementary Education, Music Materials and Procedures and School Health Problems will be taught during the first 10 weeks of the spring semester with a two-day a week field experience. During the last six weeks, the EXEL students will have full time student teaching with no additional classes except a weekly afternoon seminar.

EXEL III

This group will continue the original EXEL sequence fall semester 1975. In the spring semester they will enroll in the new program, taking the course in Methods and Field Experience for Math and Science with a six hour per week field experience. In the fall of 1976, they will enroll in the Teaching of Reading and the Methods and Field Experience in Language Arts with a six hour participation. Somewhere between now and spring 1977, they will need to pick up the three courses presently designated for their final semester so that the final semester may be left free for full-time student teaching, Remedial Reading, and Methods and Media in Elementary Education.

The new elementary program abandons the special field experience and seminars in physical education, art, and music, thus reducing the field experiences to four semesters instead of five. It also reduces

the hours spent in field experiences during the first three semesters to six per week rather than EXEL's twelve, and increases the actual full-time student teaching to 12-14 weeks. We feel that the reduced hours in pre-student teaching experience along with special methods will not materially alter its effectiveness if the correlation between the field experience and the methods seminars is maintained.

In response to suggestions by both EXEL students and cooperating teachers, we hope to involve public school teachers more actively in the methods seminars. Since they are closer to current materials and practices in subject matter areas, their input would be very valuable.

Two final recommendations: (1) Professors involved in conducting special methods seminars must be given credit hour time to supervise field experiences of students enrolled in those seminars. No one is suggesting that just putting students out into schools is the answer to better teacher preparation. Only if that experience is based on solid teaching-learning theory and strengthened by a continuous opportunity for feedback to the seminar will it be a truly effective experience. Students need input from the seminar for use in planning learning experiences in the classroom, and then ample opportunity to discuss their successes or failures afterwards in the seminar. The college supervisor must have time to consult with cooperating teachers concerning the objectives and requirements of the program. This interpersonal relationship and communication is basic to the personal growth and development of the participants.

Research in teacher effectiveness constantly reiterates the findings that knowledge of subject matter and methodology do not necessarily make a successful teacher. It is the quality of the person that determines the effectiveness of the method, and personal growth and develop-

ment come about through enhancing and supportive interpersonal relationships with creative, committed, and professional teachers.

(2) A Coordinator of Field Experiences charged with the responsibility of placing students in the public schools and orienting public school teachers and principals as to their role is a "must". Prominent in the feedback from the questionnaire was the desire for more understanding and communication between campus and cooperating school. Ways must be found to enhance this. Some suggestions might be (1) continuing the preservice orientation dinner; (2) seminar professors meeting with each cooperating school staff in a regular faculty meeting at the beginning of each semester; (3) concentration of field experience for any one academic area in a minimum number of schools (this might help the transportation problem too); (4) more effective liaison with other divisions in the College in the matter of scheduling so that students may have a full day for each field experience.

If there is to be personal contact, then someone must be given time to arrange orientation and inservice meetings. It seems to the writer that this is the key to the whole process. There must be constant liaison between the college coordinator, the field practicum methods instructor, and the cooperating teacher and this takes time. The COP program provided an excellent example which the college followed only half-heartedly. Mrs. Josephs and two other staff members were employed full-time to coordinate the COP program which involved approximately 100 students at any given time. She was available to both schools and participating students at any time. A college professor working full-time in other areas and sharing a secretary with nine others simply cannot coordinate the field program properly.

PERSONAL SUMMARY

When I consider the responses from the research questionnaire, the comments of cooperating school staffs, the self-evaluations of the EXEL participants, plus the intense and personal relationship I have had with the twelve graduates, I cannot help but feel that we have all learned a great deal about the metamorphosis of a beginning teacher. I believe our initial assumptions outlined in the beginning of this report were affirmed. I feel I can echo Beth's comment that "despite all the hardships, work, uncertainties, blood, sweat, and ditto masters," EXEL was worth the effort.

Margaret H. Swann
Coordinator
EXEL Program
Shepherd College
Shepherdstown, W. Va. 25443

APPENDIX

SHEPHERD COLLEGE
STUDENT TEACHER FOLLOW-UP

Please respond as objectively, honestly, and frankly as possible. In using the rating scale, read the characteristic and the descriptive statement or question and then rate the student teacher on the 3-point scale in terms of whether he/she displayed these characteristics not as well as, as well as, or better than other student teachers you have had from Shepherd College.

	Not as well as	As well as	Better than
1. ACADEMIC BACKGROUND (Did the student seem to know and feel comfortable with the subject matter he was expected to teach?)			
2. KNOWLEDGE AND USE OF GOOD TEACHING METHODS (Did the student use a variety of teaching strategies and techniques such as - telling, demonstrating, discovery, learning centers, experiments?)			
3. CREATIVE INPUT (Was there evidence of originality, an ability to synthesize and utilize resources in creative ways?)			
4. CONFIDENCE-SELF-ASSURANCE (Did the student display confidence in his ability to assume total teaching responsibilities? Was he secure in the role of teacher?)			
5. PROFESSIONALISM (Did the student exhibit positive attitudes toward the responsibilities of teaching in a professional way? Did he/she seem committed to teaching as a profession?)			
6. COOPERATION-TEAMWORK (Was the student able to cooperate wholeheartedly and effectively with other members of your staff?)			

	Not as well as	As well as	Better than
7. EMOTIONAL STABILITY (Did the student seem in control of himself, organized, not easily upset, able to "roll with the punches"?)			
8. DISCIPLINE (Was the student able to handle conflicts, unacceptable behavior, etc., in a way that provided a healthy learning environment?)			
9. Please rate the overall performance as compared to other student teachers you have known.			

Please add any additional comments you might like to make that would help us determine whether the extended pre-student teaching experience in the public schools, which the EXEL students had, does, in fact, produce more competent student teachers.

Return to:

Margaret H. Swann
Coordinator EXEL
Shepherd College
Shepherdstown, W. Va. 25443

EDUCATIONAL ASSURANCE INDEX

DIRECTIONS: Following are a number of statements indicating how a teacher might feel regarding various educational responsibilities. By circling the letters given below, indicate the degree to which you personally agree or disagree with each statement as follows: SA-Strongly Agree, A-Agree, U-Uncertain, D-Disagree, SD-Strongly Disagree. There are no right or wrong answers, so please respond candidly to each statement.

SA A U D SD 1. If I were asked to plan a one-hour lesson to teach a group of ten-year-old children how to use a new classification scheme in categorizing certain objects, I would have a pretty good idea of how to put together the lesson plan.

SA A U D SD 2. When it comes to deciding what kinds of things should be emphasized in my class, I really don't know how to approach the problem.

SA A U D SD 3. If a well-informed parent asked me to describe several instructional principles which, if incorporated in a teaching sequence, would lead to good results, I'm not sure I could supply a very good answer.

SA A U D SD 4. If I were teaching a brand new course, I believe I could employ techniques so that the second time I taught the course it would be markedly better than it was the first time.

SA A U D SD 5. If I were asked to participate in a cooperative effort to evaluate school teachers on the basis of their instructional skill, I believe I have some insights which would be quite useful.

SA A U D SD 6. In the event that a group of parents sought my help in attempting to determine which educational aims should be emphasized in their children's school, I would be able to describe tangible ways of making such decisions.

SA A U D SD 7. Although individualizing our educational programs has been a time-honored goal of most teachers, I am genuinely perplexed as to how I should actually individualize instruction in a classroom.

SA A U D SD 8. I really don't know very much about how to construct valid tests which measure important kinds of learner outcomes.

SA A U D SD 9. By and large, I think I know quite a bit about how to map out an instructional sequence that will really work.

SA A U D SD 10. If I were asked to join a school district's curriculum design staff for one year, it would probably take me half that time just to learn what was involved in making curriculum decisions.

SA A U D SD 11. If I were asked to address a parent-teacher association meeting on the topic "Evaluating Instructional Enterprises", I would have to do an immense amount of homework to prepare, for it is a topic I'm not too comfortable with right now.

SA A U D SD 12. Assuming a group of teachers asked me to present a model thirty minute lesson which would incorporate principles of effective instruction, I think I could do so rather well.

SA A U D SD 13. Although most educators agree that there are important educational goals beyond mere subject matter mastery, I don't feel very comfortable about my ability to describe educational goals dealing with such things as learner's interests, attitudes, or values.

SA A U D SD 14. If I were a supervising teacher to whom a student teacher was assigned for a semester, I think I could supply the student teacher with a wealth of advice regarding how to select defensible educational goals.

SA A U D SD 15. Judging the quality of teaching is a difficult task, yet I believe I know some practical techniques for helping teachers appraise their own effectiveness.

DATA ON INTEGRATION OF ON-CAMPUS AND FIELD PRACTICUM OF EXEL STUDENTS

The student had the opportunity to:

HIGHLY SUCCESSFUL	AVERAGE SUCCESS	LITTLE OR NO SUCCESS	
			1. Observe children in many formal and informal activities found in the elementary school.
			2. Establish a personal rapport with the class.
			3. Become familiar with curriculum and materials in all subject areas.
			4. Plan, teach and evaluate a number of lessons involving a single child and a group of children.
			5. Become familiar with the children in a classroom and their general learning needs.
			6. Work with children in an informal analysis of reading level and math skills.
			7. Conduct pupil-teacher conference and record observations and impressions.
			8. Become familiar with the concept of grouping for instruction on the basis of need.
			9. Use various available kinds of media and materials.
			10. Carry out some of the non-instructional tasks of a teacher.
			11. Relate the on-campus education course work to the field experience in seminars.

HIGHLY SUCCESSFUL	AVERAGE SUCCESS	LITTLE OR NO SUCCESS	
			12. Put into practice the concepts and procedure presented in the on-campus methods seminars.
			13. One of the major improvements in the EXEL program over the traditional one is the opportunity for teachers in the public schools to provide the kinds of learning experiences students need in order to relate what is being discussed and proposed in "methods" classrooms to the <u>real</u> world of children and classrooms.
			14. The structure of the EXEL program and the more intensive clinical experience develop a higher level of competence generally on the part of the EXEL student.

EXEL PERCEPTIONS

General Instructions: This questionnaire is being submitted to EXEL I (seniors), principals, and cooperating teachers who have had these EXEL students in their schools and classes. Be sure to indicate the category to which you belong by checking below:

___Principal ___Cooperating Teacher ___ EXEL Student

Please check in the column that best describes your perceptions of the EXEL program.

HIGHLY SUCCESSFUL	AVERAGE SUCCESS	LITTLE OR NO SUCCESS	DATA ON WORKING RELATIONSHIPS
			1. The EXEL program provides for a closer relationship between the Shepherd College faculty, the EXEL cooperating teachers, and the building principals in meeting the needs of the college students.
			2. The EXEL program provides for adequate interaction between the college and the schools in the program.
			3. The cooperating teacher has the opportunity to communicate the concerns and problems of the cooperating school to the college.
			4. The college supervisor is an effective liaison between the college and the public school.
			5. The college supervisor is effective in interpreting the general requirements of the various field practicums to the cooperating teacher.
			6. The building principal is able to provide EXEL students with information about the school, curriculum, student population, the staff, and the community.
			7. The college conveys the idea to cooperating teachers and principals that it views them as valuable extensions of the college's commitment to teacher education.

SUGGESTED SCHEDULE FOR STUDENTS IN ELEMENTARY EDUCATION, EXEL

Freshman Year

Written English 101	3	Written English 102	3
Hist. of Civ. 101	3	Hist. of Civ. 102	3
Gen'l. Biol. Sci. 101	4	Gen'l. Biol. Sci 102	4
Prin. of World Geog. 101	3	Pers. & Comm. Hyg. 103	3
Intro. to Vis. Arts 103	2	Music App. 111	2
Orient. in P.E. 121 or 123	1	Orient. in P.E. 122 or 124	1
	16		16

Sophomore Year

Fund. of Speech 202	3	Found. of Am. Ed. 200	3
Gen'l Phys. Sci. 103	4	Gen'l. Phys. Sci. 104	4
Sur. of Eng. Lit. 203	3	Sur. of Am. Lit. 204	3
Music as Art & Sci. 100	2	Am. Fed. Gov't. 101	3
Rhythms 221	1	Games 201	1
Teaching Field	4	Field Exp. & Sem. in P.E. 201	2
	17		16

Junior Year

Amer. Hist. 201	3	Amer. Hist. 202	3
Intro. to Math 215	3	Math for Elem. Tchrs. 300	3
Gen. Soc. 203	3	Human Devel. 302	3
Human Devel. 301	3	Teaching Field	5
Field Exp. & Sem. in Soc. Sci. 314	3	Field Exp. & Sem. in Math & Science 315	4
Art in Elem. Ed. 320	2		18
	17		

Senior Year

W. Va. Hist. 209	3	Music Mat. & Proc. 236	3
Prin. of Econ. 205	3	Art & Crafts in El. Sch. 322	2
Background of Lit. 202	3	School Health Problems 360	3
Teaching Field	3	Field Exp. & Sem. in Art & Music 411	4
Field Exp. & Sem. in Lang. Arts & Reading 410	4		12
	16		